Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

A280.39
M34Am
cop.3

FARM POPULATION

CHARACTERISTICS OF FARM-OPERATOR HOUSEHOLDS BY NUMBER OF YOUNG CHILDREN

LIBRARY
SEP 7 1956
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE Agricultural Marketing Service

Agriculture - Washington
AMS - 118

Washington, D. C.
June 1956

CONTENTS

Page
Introduction.......... 1
Age and marital status.......... 2
Region and color.......... 2
Economic class of farm.......... 2
Dependence on agriculture.......... 5
Total family income.......... 6
Type of farm.......... 7
Tenure of farm.......... 7
Replacement indexes.......... 9
Definitions and explanations.......... 10
Source and reliability of data.......... 10

TEXT TABLES

A.--Number of children ever born per 1,000 women 45 to 49 years old, by marital status of woman and urban-rural residence, for the United States: 1950, 1940, and 1910.......... 1
B.--Percentage distribution by color of women 15 to 49 years old in farm-operator households, by economic class of farm, for the South: 1950.......... 3
C.--Standard error of estimated numbers, for the United States and regions.......... 15

DETAILED TABLES

1.--Summary: Women 15 to 49 years old in farm-operator households by number of children under 5 years old, by marital status, color, and age of woman, for the United States and regions, 1950.......... 17
2.--Economic class of farm: Women 15 to 49 years old in farm-operator households by number of children under 5 years old, by marital status, for the United States and regions, with color for the South, 1950.......... 18
3.--Degree of dependence on agriculture in 1949: Women 15 to 49 years old in farm-operator households by number of children under 5 years old, by marital status, for the United States and regions, with color for the South, 1950.......... 19
4.--Total family income in 1949: Women 15 to 49 years old, ever married, in farm-operator households, by number of children under 5 years old, for the United States and regions, 1950.......... 21
5.--Type of farm: Women 15 to 49 years old in farm-operator households by number of children under 5 years old, by marital status, for the United States and regions, with color for the South, 1950.......... 22
6.--Tenure of farm: Women 15 to 49 years old in farm-operator households by number of children under 5 years old, by marital status, for the United States and regions, with color for the South, 1950.......... 23
7.--Replacement indexes: Number of children under 5 years old in farm-operator households per 100 children necessary to replace the population, by selected household and farm characteristics, for the United States and regions, with color for the South, 1950.......... 25

CHARACTERISTICS OF FARM-OPERATOR HOUSEHOLDS BY NUMBER OF YOUNG CHILDREN

By

Calvin L. Beale,
Analytical Statistician,
Agricultural Marketing Service

Introduction.--For many years it has been recognized that the average rural family in the United States has more children than the average urban family, and that farm families are larger than nonfarm families among the rural population. The 1950 Census of Population showed that the number of children ever born per 1,000 women aged 45 to 49 years was 3,564 among rural-farm women, 2,626 among rural-nonfarm women, and 1,957 among urban women.[1] About 2,160 children per 1,000 women living through the childbearing years are necessary under current mortality levels to replace the population from one generation to another.[2] Thus rural women of recently completed childbearing have made heavy contributions to the growth of the nation's population, whereas the urban group has failed to maintain its numbers.

Urban fertility has been more thoroughly studied than rural, probably because urban fertility has always been lower than the national average and, in many cities, has been insufficient over extended periods even for replacement of the parent population. Considerable information has accumulated from both public and private studies on the differences in family size between the various social and economic classes of the urban population. On the other hand, with no cause for concern over the adequacy of the farm birth rate, much less has been done to learn whether significant differences exist in the number of children born in farm families, when characteristics such as type of farming, type of tenure, economic class of farm, degree of dependence on agriculture, and income are considered.[3] Although the average farm family is relatively large today, it is much smaller than a generation ago. Table A reveals that the average number of children ever born to farm women 45 to 49 years old in 1950 was a third lower than the average for 1910. It would be surprising if the considerable decline in farm family size in this century had not been accompanied by varying fertility levels among the several elements of the farm population.

TABLE A.--Number of children ever born per 1,000 women 45 to 49 years old, by marital status of woman and urban-rural residence, for the United States: 1950, 1940 and 1910

Year	Number of children ever born							
	Per 1,000 total women				Per 1,000 women ever married			
	United States	Urban	Rural nonfarm	Rural farm	United States	Urban	Rural nonfarm	Rural farm
1950----	2,292	1,957	2,626	3,564	2,492	2,154	2,806	3,733
1940----	2,740	2,295	2,986	3,962	2,998	2,552	3,228	4,160
1910----	4,295	3,615	4,270	5,553	4,744	4,098	4,704	5,869

Source: Bureau of the Census, U. S. Census of Population: 1950, Special Report, Fertility, table 1; and Sixteenth Census of the United States, Special Report, Differential Fertility, 1940 and 1910 - Fertility for States and Large Cities, table 4.

---

[1] Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Population: 1950. Vol. IV, Special Reports, Part 5, Chapter C, Fertility. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1955. Table 1.

[2] Ibid. Page 8.

[3] An earlier study of the United States Department of Agriculture on fertility and economic class of farm is reported in "Changing Fertility Differentials Among Farm-Operator Families in Relation to Economic Size of Farm," by Margaret Jarman Hagood, Rural Sociology, Vol. 13, No. 4, December 1948.

This report presents data on ratios of children to women of childbearing age in farm-operator households derived from a sample of the returns of the 1950 Censuses of Population and Agriculture. The matching of data from these two censuses for identical persons offered the opportunity to relate the childbearing patterns in farm-operator households to some of the major features of their farm operation.[4] The sample data are subject to a certain degree of variability, of course, as described in the section on "Source and Reliability of Data." The measure of fertility used is the number of children under 5 years old per 1,000 women 15 to 49 years old. This is commonly termed a "fertility ratio." Even though this ratio is a measure of recent rather than lifetime fertility, it is, in the absence of statistics on the total number of children born per woman, a useful index of variation in family size among groups.

Statistics on the characteristics of farm-laborer households by number of young children are not available from this study. Farm laborers as a group on the average are much younger than farm operators and thus not as likely to be married. However, it is known that, age for age, wives of farm laborers usually have more children than the wives of farm operators.[5]

Age and marital status.--In the country as a whole in 1950 there were 483 children under 5 years old in farm-operator households for every 1,000 women 15 to 49 years old. (The comparable ratio in the nonfarm population was 389 per 1,000.) The ratio was highest among women 25 to 29 years old. They averaged one young child for every woman. Among women who had ever been married, ratios of more than 1,100 children under 5 years per 1,000 are found in age group 20 to 24 years as well as 25 to 29. These are the peak childbearing years--the ratios decline among older women. But, even at ages 45 to 49 there were more than 100 preschool-age children for every 1,000 women. Not in every case were these older women the actual mothers of the young children, but in most instances they were caring for them.

Beyond age 30, fertility ratios related to all women do not differ much from those of women ever married. At such ages about 95 percent of the women living in farm-operator households are married or have been married. In general, farm women marry early, and many of those who remain single move to cities and towns.

Regions and color.--Dividing the nation into two major regions, North and West combined, and South, the fertility ratios of women in farm-operator households when standardized for age were about 13 percent higher in the South than in the North and West (510 children per 1,000 women against 451). The standardized ratios for the North and West separately were practically identical. Higher fertility in the South is largely the product of the high birth rates of nonwhite farm families. As nearly a fourth of the Southern women in the survey were nonwhite, in contrast to less than 1 percent in the North and West, nonwhite fertility made a substantial contribution to total Southern fertility, but had little effect upon ratios elsewhere. The standardized fertility ratio of 466 per 1,000 white women in farm-operator households of the South differed very little from that of 451 for the North and West combined. However, nonwhite women in the South (very largely Negro) showed a ratio of 660 per 1,000.

Economic class of farm.--When farms are classified by economic class based on the total value of farm products sold, a rather consistent inverse relationship between class of farm and the fertility of farm-operator households is evident, especially when fertility ratios are standardized for age (table 2). The lowest ratio among commercial farms, 432 per 1,000 women, was found among farms selling over $10,000 worth of products in 1949 (classes I and II). The ratios were higher among women on smaller-scale farms, rising to a maximum of 580 on the least productive commercial farms

---

[4] The major body of data tabulated from this matching study covers a wide range of subjects. It is published in Farms and Farm People, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1953, a cooperative report of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce; and in "Classification of the Agricultural Population in the United States," by Louis J. Ducoff, Journal of Farm Economics, Vol. XXXVII, No. 3, August 1955.

[5] U. S. Census of Population: 1950, Special Reports, Fertility, *op. cit.*, table 28.

TABLE B.--Percentage distribution by color of women 15 to 49 years old in farm-operator households, by economic class of farm, for the South: 1950

Economic class of farm	Total	White	Nonwhite
All farms	100.0	74.5	25.5
Commercial farms	100.0	71.8	28.2
Classes I and II	100.0	95.3	4.7
Class III	100.0	88.3	11.7
Class IV	100.0	79.3	20.7
Class V	100.0	69.4	30.6
Class VI	100.0	58.5	41.5
Noncommercial farms	100.0	79.2	20.8
Part-time or abnormal	100.0	81.8	18.2
Residential	100.0	77.7	22.3

Source: Table 2, this report.

(class VI - farms selling goods worth $250 to $1,199 and having little or no income from nonfarm sources). In effect, class of farm is more than just a measure of economic status, for the more a commercial farm produces the more likely it is to be located within a metropolitan area close to the urban influences of a large city.[6] But little evidence of any association between recent fertility and economic class of commercial farms is found in the North and West (table 2). In these regions, highest and lowest standardized ratios among commercial classes differ by only 5 percent.

In marked contrast to the pattern in the rest of the country, the South had a regular and sharp decrease of fertility with increasing economic class of farm. Class VI farms showed a ratio of children to women of 604 per 1,000, about 45 percent higher than the ratio of 414 for classes I, II, and III combined, with classes IV and V at intermediate levels. Class I and II farms were not numerous enough in the sample to be shown separately from class III in the South. The inverse association between fertility and class of farm in the South is to a considerable extent the product of differences in the race composition of the population of the various economic classes. Table B shows that the distribution by color ranged from less than 5 percent nonwhite on class I and II farms up to 40 percent nonwhite on class VI farms. Thus the role of the nonwhite population in determining the total level of fertility is unimportant in classes I and II, or for that matter class III, but is substantial in classes V and VI.

Differences in numbers of children born by economic class of farm are not entirely explained by race composition. A clear association remains between the number of children born to white farm women in the South and the economic class of farms on which they live. This cannot be demonstrated for nonwhite women. The number of nonwhite Southern households in the sample is too small to permit comparisons among commercial farms, except for classes V and VI, where the standardized fertility ratios were nearly identical; 706 and 705. The ratio for white Southern women on class V farms was 481 and on class VI farms 541. Thus nonwhite women on low-production farms had considerably more young children than white women on farms of comparable production. Comparable production is not equivalent to comparable income, however, for low-production white farmers more commonly have nonfarm income from sources such as off-farm work or renting of land.[7] But the fact that nonwhite women on class V farms had a much higher standardized fertility ratio (706) than did white women on the lower-producing class VI farms (541) invites the conclusion that influential noneconomic causes contribute to the differential between white and nonwhite farm-family size. The difference in fertility ratios between high-production and low-production white-operator farms was no greater than the fertility difference between white and nonwhite families of the same economic class.

---

[6] The percentage of farms located in Standard Metropolitan Areas in 1950 by economic class of farm follows: class I, 17.2; class II, 12.7; class III, 10.2; class IV, 8.5; class V, 7.5; class VI, 5.9; part-time or abnormal, 12.9; and residential, 14.2. Data computed by the Agricultural Marketing Service.

[7] Ducoff, "Classification of the Agricultural Population in the United States," op. cit., table 2.

When ratios of children to women in the North and West combined, are compared by economic class with the white-operator households of the South, ratios are found to be higher in the North and West for classes I, II, and III, but higher in the South for the low-production classes V and VI. Class IV rates are nearly equal. One may speculate about the meaning and potential of this situation. The demographic position of the North and West can be considered relatively advanced, in that a lowered rate of childbearing has been adopted by all economic classes of the farm population. Furthermore, the upper economic classes are not composed of just a small fraction of the people who might readily differ from the mass of the farm population in such qualities as education and values regarding family size. Indeed, 38 percent of the farm people in the North and West in 1950 lived on class I, II, or III farms. On the other hand, Southern white people who live on such farms comprise only 11 percent of Southern white farm population, and but 9 percent of the total Southern farm population. The disparity between their education and that of people on lower-production farms is greater than that between similar production groups in the North and West.

Since 1940, when the national trend to a higher birth rate began, much leveling of fertility differences between economic and social groups has occurred. It will be interesting to observe in the future whether the pattern of childbearing among Southern farm women becomes more like that of farm women elsewhere. Such a trend would involve an increase in the number of children born to the upper economic classes, a substantial reduction of births on low-production farms, and probably a considerable upward shift in the distribution of farms by economic class.

In addition to the commercial economic classes discussed previously, there are the noncommercial farms termed part-time or residential. Farms are considered part-time enterprises if the value of products sold in the last year was between $250 and $1, 199, provided that the operator worked 100 or more days off the farm or that income received from nonfarm sources by him and his family exceeded the value of farm products sold. For the nation, women on such farms had a standardized fertility ratio of 425. This is the lowest ratio of any of the economic classes--commercial or noncommercial. It would seem reasonable to presume that the rural values of life commonly associated with good-size families are somewhat attenuated on part-time farms in view of the considerable dependence of such farmers upon nonfarm sources of employment and income. Women on part-time farms are more likely than those on commercial farms to be employed away from home. This is another reason for their having fewer children. Part-time farm families are rather mixed in agricultural status. Many represent farmers who expect to farm on a part-time basis permanently. Some are making a transition out of agriculture, while others are attempting to enter it on a full-time basis.

Residential farm-operator households show fertility ratios rather close to the national average for all farms. A farm is termed residential if it sells less than $250 worth of farm products annually. To the extent that farm fertility is related to degree of rurality or to dependence on agriculture, this level of fertility is rather surprising, for the majority of residential farmers have their primary employment in nonfarm jobs. Furthermore, residential farms are more often found in metropolitan areas than any other class of farm except class I. But residential farmers are a rather heterogeneous group. In contrast to those who have good nonfarm income but choose to live on "a little place in the country," a sizeable minority of the group subsist at the bottom of the economic ladder, lacking in either sufficient farm or nonfarm income. More than a third of the residential operators in 1949 had less than $250 of nonfarm family income, while producing less than $250 worth of farm products for sale.[8] Many of this group probably have rather large families, tending to offset the lower fertility of the more urban-like or industrialized residential farmers. Many of the numerous residential farmers in the Appalachian Plateau work as coal miners, an occupational class of traditionally high fertility.

---

[8] Farms and Farm People, op. cit., page 74.

Dependence on agriculture.--As was evident in the discussion of noncommercial classes of farms, no sharp break in the economy is found between full family dependence on agriculture and no dependence on it. Instead, great variation exists among farm-operator families in the extent of their connections with farming. In 1950 about two-fifths of such families reported that all of their income was derived from farming. In more than half the remaining families the income from nonfarm sources was greater than the total value of products sold from the farm.[9] Nonfarm income derives mostly from off-farm work, although it may also come from sources such as rents or investments. Families on low-production farms are relatively more dependent on nonfarm income than are other families, but even among class I, II, and III farms over one-fifth of the operators do some off-farm work.[10]

In view of the fact that agricultural families are traditionally larger in size than those in other occupations, it seems logical to suppose that women in farm households engaged exclusively in farming would have more children than those in farm households having off-farm work or income. Thus, it is hardly surprising to find in table 3 that the age-standardized ratio of children to women in farm households without nonfarm income (501) was somewhat higher than the ratio of 471 in households with nonfarm income.

Differences are greater when off-farm work is considered. The ratio was 515 when no family member worked off-farm; 474 when the operator did off-farm work (regardless of whether some other family member also worked); and 349 when the operator did no off-farm work but some other family member did. The large reduction in fertility evident in the last category probably reflects the fact that the member working off the farm was frequently one of the women of the family and that employment by women is historically associated with smaller-than-average families. An additional factor here is that many women in these households are single. The standardized ratio for women ever married in such households was 590, not strikingly lower than the ratio for all ever-married women, 637. It is well to note that none of the differentials cited here, or otherwise evident from table 3, may be termed wide or extreme, with the exception of the deviation in total fertility in households that reported off-farm work by a family member but none by the operator. Only a few of the ratios vary as much as 10 percent from the national or regional averages.

It is interesting to note that among households reporting no off-farm work by anyone, the minority having some supplementary income from nonfarm sources had higher fertility than those completely dependent on agriculture.

For similar degrees of dependence on agriculture, the fertility of women in the North and West combined differed appreciably in only three categories from that of white women in the South. Women in Northern and Western households in which the operator worked 1 to 49 days off-farm in 1949 had a standardized ratio of 460 compared with 527 for Southern white women in similar households. On the other hand, when the off-farm work amounted to 50 to 199 days the ratio was highest in the North and West (493) rather than in the South (418). Finally, the fertility of total women in households in which the operator did not work off-farm, but some other family member did, was higher in the white Southern households (330) than in the North and West (267). This inequality derives from regional differences in the proportion of single women.

A look at the data for the South on degree of dependence on agriculture illustrates once again the advantage of examining Southern fertility statistics separately by color. There are major differences in degree of dependence on agriculture between the white and nonwhite Southern farm populations. Thus, fertility ratios for all Southern farm women vary more by degree of dependence on agriculture than is the case among either white or nonwhite women separately. Nonwhite Southern farm operators rely much more on agriculture than do their white neighbors. White farmers are more likely to work off-farm; they average many more days of work when they do so; and if a white family does no off-farm work it is much more likely than a nonwhite family to have some other type of nonfarm income. In all degrees of dependency on agriculture, fertility of nonwhite women was considerably above that of white women. Women in households where the operator worked off-farm had somewhat fewer young children in both color groups than women in households where no off-farm work was done. Among white women it can be shown that fertility was measurably lower when the operator worked more than 50 days off-farm, but it cannot be shown that it was further lowered by the equivalent of full-time off-farm work (200 or more days). In fact the ratio is a little higher in the second class (200 or more days) than in the first (50 to 199 days).

---

[9] Ducoff, "Classification of the Agricultural Population in the United States," op. cit., table 1.
[10] Farms and Farm People, op. cit., page 74.

In sum, degree of dependence on agriculture does not appear in itself to be highly correlated with fertility levels. If fertility levels by degree of dependence on agriculture could be cross-classified by income or economic class of farm a different picture might be presented. Without such a tabulation the intrinsic associations between fertility and dependence on agriculture which may exist when total income is held constant are partly masked by the unequal economic (and probably social) makeup of the broad dependence-on-agriculture classes.

About the most that can be concluded from the data in this report is that: (1) Households fully or primarily dependent on agriculture have somewhat higher fertility ratios than those mainly dependent on nonagriculture; (2) off-farm work is more clearly associated with reduced fertility than is nonfarm income from other sources; and (3) the lowest relative number of young children is found among households where off-farm work is performed by members other than the operator himself.

Total family income. --Table 4 presents statistics on fertility ratios in farm-operator households by total family income in 1949, regardless of the source of income. At the national level the ratios decline invariably with increasing income among women ever married. (Data are not available by income for total women including those single.) These values range from a standardized ratio of 721 in families with less than $500 cash income down to 562 in the group reporting $6,000 and over. Without a larger sample it was not possible to subdivide further the $6,000 and over group.

In the North and West there seems to be no simple relationship between recent fertility and income level - just as there was none between fertility and other economic characteristics. The highest ratios are observed at the $1,000 to $2,499 income level. From this point they decline through the $3,500 to $4,499 interval, beyond which they rise somewhat. The lowest income group of all, under $1,000, showed a standardized value (565) lower than either the average fertility (604) or the fertility of the highest income group (606).

In the South, the survey showed a consistent negative relation between fertility and total income; the higher the income, the lower fertility. At the extremes, women ever married in households receiving less than $500 showed a ratio of 760, 40 percent higher than that of 542 found in households with $3,500 or more income. It must be acknowledged that the highest income interval here - $3,500 or more - is certainly not high by nonfarm standards, but it is the highest that can be utilized in the sample. Less than a seventh of the women in Southern farm-operator households who had ever been married lived in households that received as much as $3,500 income in 1949.

Fertility data by total income are not available by color of women, so it cannot be said with certainty what was the extent of the association between income and fertility in the South within the white and nonwhite populations separately. It is of interest to note that farm women in the upper income brackets in the South, that is, those with $2,500 or more total family income, had fewer young children than did women of comparable income in the North and West. Thus the higher total fertility of the farm-operator population of the South as compared with the rest of the nation is attributable solely to the high fertility of families with less than $2,500 income, and to the large proportion that such families form of all families in the Southern farm population.

Type of farm.--The type of farming that a farmer engages in may have many effects upon his way of life and the values that he holds. For example, a tobacco farmer may feel the need for family labor more strongly than an operator of a highly mechanized grain farm. Or a farmer whose crop year has definite slack periods, such as a cotton farmer, may be better able to engage in periodic off-farm work than the farmer subject to the unremitting chores of a dairy farm. Thus it seemed reasonable to look for variations in population fertility by type of farm. (Only commercial farms are shown by type.)

Whereas the survey showed some variation in fertility ratios among field crop, general, and livestock products farms, these differences resolve themselves largely into regional or color differences. The concentration of particular types of farms in certain regions of the country makes regional comparisons of the same type of farm difficult without a survey sample larger than the one here studied. Women in the households of cotton and "other" field crop farmers (largely tobacco farmers) had the highest recent fertility, considerably higher than that of women on other types of commercial farms. Field crop farms other than cash-grain are overwhelmingly located in the South.

Women on Southern cotton farms were numerous enough to provide separate figures by color. It was found that white women on Southern cotton farms differed little in average number of young children from women on all Northern and Western commercial farms. However, their age-standardized fertility ratio of 484 was only three-fourths as high as the ratio of 658 for nonwhite women on cotton farms. White women on the "other" field crop farms of the South had higher fertility than any type of farm group in the North and West or any other white group in the South. The sample is not large enough to tabulate data separately for all of the less numerous types in the South. The fertility ratio of women on general farms (513) was close to the Southern average, but Southern livestock and poultry farm women showed a ratio (434) lower than the Northern and Western average as well as the Southern average. Southern nonwhite women were so heavily concentrated on cotton farms that reliable ratios for nonwhites could only be computed for this type. However, it appears that the fertility of nonwhite women on "other" field crop farms was at least as high as that of nonwhite women on cotton farms.

Within the North and West the data suggest that women on livestock and poultry farms had somewhat fewer young children than women on other farms, while the dairy farm households had the highest fertility of any major type-of-farm population outside the South. Of more importance is the fact that none of the fertility differentials by type of farm in the North and West was great, ranging only from 495 on dairy farms to 447 on livestock and poultry farms combined.

In conclusion, the only farm-types whose population evidenced distinctly higher-than-average fertility were "other" field crop farms and nonwhite cotton farms. "Other" field crop farmers are mainly tobacco farmers, together with smaller numbers of operators that specialize in such crops as peanuts, potatoes, sugarcane, and sugar beets. Perhaps women on vegetable, fruit and nut, and miscellaneous type farms were considerably below the average in number of young children, but the data are not reliable enough to support a firm conclusion. These farms are frequently found in and around cities.

Tenure of farm.--Type of tenancy has traditionally had both a social and an economic implication. In the literature the concept "tenure ladder" is frequently encountered, signifying a hierarchy of tenants with the share tenant or cropper on the bottom rung among operators, the share-cash or cash tenant in an intermediate position, and the owner-operator at the top. This hierarchy is reflected in the standard order in which farmers are listed by tenure in statistical tables such as table 6.

Like most generalizations the tenure ladder has its exceptions. A tenant may be a farmer lacking in capital or in management ability. On the other hand, he may be the renter of land which by its very bountifulness has attracted absentee ownership and is not for sale. Similarly, share croppers are frequently not at the bottom of the economic heap, as is often assumed. In some areas they occupy first-class land, and with the superior management facilities often available to them they not infrequently produce and realize more than neighboring cash tenants. Finally, it has come to be realized that the dominant tenure trend in the United States today is not towards full ownership of farms but rather towards part ownership. Farmers who own some land while renting more according to their needs are increasing in number. These part owners include a much greater percentage of high-production farmers than do the full owners.

From a fertility point of view the traditional tenure ladder retains much validity at the national level (table 6). The lowest fertility ratios in agriculture in the 1950 Census were found in the homes of full-owner farm operators. For the United States the standardized ratio in such homes was 426. Women on part-owner farms showed a slightly higher ratio (454). This was almost entirely due, however, to fertility differences in the North and West. Ratios for both owner classes were substantially lower than for all tenant groups combined (586). Among tenants, ratios increased with decreasing rank on the tenure scale: cash and share-cash combined, 573; share tenants except croppers, 602; and croppers, 615.

This pattern was modified in the two major regions. The disparity between the fertility of owner women and tenant women was considerably more in the South than in the North and West. Within the Southern tenant class it was the croppers who had the lowest ratios of children to women and the cash and share-cash tenants who had the highest. Croppers had lowest tenant fertility both among white and nonwhite women. This appears somewhat surprising on a priori grounds for in general a cropper's capital is his family labor. However, the relatively low fertility of cropper families has been noted in other studies.[11] The wide difference in fertility of white and nonwhite women of a given class, noted earlier for economic class of farm and type of farm, also prevailed among tenure types. The lowest fertility among Southern nonwhites occurred among full-owner and part-owner women combined (642). This figure is higher than those found for any tenure type in the North and West or for white-operated Southern farms.

One interesting feature of fertility ratios by tenure is the extent to which the previously cited standardized ratios differ from the unstandardized ones. The average tenant farmer is younger than the average owner, especially the average full owner, for many tenants enter the owner class only after they succeed in saving enough capital during their tenant years. Age for age, tenant families also contain fewer single women than do owner families. As a result, fertility ratios for ever-married women are more similar for these two broad tenancy types than are the ratios for total women.

It was possible in compiling the survey data to obtain separate figures for women ever-married by tenancy and commercial or noncommercial class. The results, given only for full-owners and all tenants, do not show a consistent pattern. In the North and West women on commercial full-owner farms had higher fertility than women on noncommercial full-owner farms. The opposite is true in the South. Among tenants, reliable figures at the regional level are available only for the South as a whole. No fertility difference between commercial and noncommercial tenants is evident. At the national level, noncommercial tenants showed higher ratios than commercial, largely because of the higher proportion that Southern farmers form of total noncommercial tenants than of commercial. Tenant farms that fail to produce enough to be rated as commercial farms in census terminology are common in the South but not numerous in the North and West.

---

[11] For example, see "The Reproductive Pattern of the Rural Negroes of the Yazoo-Mississippi Delta," by Joseph S. Vandiver, Social Forces, Vol. 29, No. 1, October 1950; "Negro Rural Fertility Ratios in the Mississippi Delta," by Conrad Taeuber and Irene B. Taeuber, The Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, Vol. XXI, No. 3, December 1940.

Replacement index.--The significance of differential fertility ratios becomes more clearly perceived when the ratios are translated into measures of population replacement. As mortality rates are low among nearly all population groups in the United States, a population that has high fertility will normally grow faster than a group with lower fertility. In table 7, replacement indexes are shown for most of the subclasses of women in farm-operator households discussed in the text. The index indicates the number of young children present in a population group in relation to the number needed to replace the female population of childbearing age (15 to 49 years). An index of 100 (termed "unity") would signify exact replacement and a population potentially stationary in numbers.

It will be seen from the table that, with one exception, all the groups measured were well above unity for the period April 1945 to April 1950. Thus a continuation of the fertility and mortality rates of that period would result in sizeable increases in all major segments of the farm-operator population. The replacement index for total farm-operator women was 168, an index sufficient if continued to increase the population by two-thirds in each generation. A replacement index based upon a 5-year span of births, such as this one, may not be representative of the longtime potential of the population if the time period studied was unusual in its fertility. The period April 1945 to April 1950 was certainly one of exceptional fertility in the country as a whole. Millions of couples had only recently been married or had just been reunited after wartime separation. Thus many births occurred that under other circumstances might have occurred at an earlier or later date. But this resurgence of the birth rate affected the number of births much more profoundly in nonfarm areas than in farm areas. Farm fertility, having been relatively high all along, was not as subject to an upward cyclical influence as was nonfarm fertility. In consequence, farm fertility during 1945 to 1950 was not particularly unrepresentative of farm fertility over a longer period.

The replacement index of white farm women was 160 and of nonwhite farm women 220. The high fertility of nonwhite farm women, coupled with the early age of marriage and childbearing that prevails among them, would result in a doubling of the nonwhite population living in farm-operator households in less than 25 years time, in the absence of movement away to nonfarm areas. This level of potential increase is equivalent to that which prevailed in the United States as a whole in post-revolutionary times. But, with the lower mortality rates in force today it is attained with far fewer births per woman than were necessary 150 years ago.

It is probable that the fertility ratios and replacement indexes of most classes of the farm population are affected by the heavy outmovement of people from farms since 1940. Between 1940 and 1950 an estimated 3,116,000 farm females 5 to 39 years old in 1940 left the farm and were living in nonfarm areas in 1950.[12] This migration was so heavy for young adults that a migration rate of 57.4 percent was observed during the decade among farm girls 10 to 14 years old in 1940.[13] Knowledge of the social and economic characteristics of farm migrants as opposed to farm nonmigrants is scanty. It is known, though, that during the 1930's women leaving farms had fewer young children than those remaining on farms.[14] This was true whether one considered ratios of children to total women or only ratios to women ever married. This situation was probably not different from 1945 to 1950. Thus women for whom replacement indexes are shown in this report do not represent "closed" populations experiencing little migration, but rather populations that constitute the survivors of a mass exodus from the farms, plus a smaller number of people who have left the farm and returned, or who have moved to farms from nonfarm origins. Since the number of workers required in agriculture is declining, it is obvious that under current farm fertility and mortality rates a large segment of farm young people must continue to seek their fortunes off the farm. Given this situation, the children now growing up on farms can hardly be expected to duplicate as a group the high reproduction rates of their parents, but the fraction who remain on the farm might well do so.

---

[12] U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Farm Population: Net Migration from the Rural-Farm Population, 1940-50, by Gladys K. Bowles, 1956. Table 2.

[13] Ibid., Table 2.

[14] U. S. Bureau of the Census, Special Report of the Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Differential Fertility, 1940 and 1910--Women by Number of Children Under 5 Years Old. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1945. Table 35.

Fertility rather than mortality is the major factor determining variations in replacement indexes in the United States; the patterns of replacement indexes among farm-operator-household women therefore are much the same as patterns of fertility ratios already discussed. A few of the indexes in table 7 are worth noting. The highest shown is 253, found among nonwhite women living on Southern cash, share-cash, and crop or livestock-share tenant farms (as a group). Not much lower than this figure are the indexes of 240 for nonwhite women on economic class V Southern farms and 239 for nonwhites on class VI farms. Among white women, the highest replacement index was 204. This was observed for white women on Southern crop or livestock-share tenant farms and was the only replacement index for whites above 200. It is noteworthy that all of the high indexes mentioned were in the South. The highest value in the North and West was 185, found among women on crop or livestock-share tenant farms. This was followed closely by indexes of 173 on dairy farms and of 172 for women in families where the farm operator had performed some off-farm work in 1949, provided he worked 50 to 199 days or the amount of nonfarm income received was less than the value of products sold from the farm. In each region and for both color groups the highest ratios occurred on farms worked on shares by tenants.

At the other extreme are the low replacement indexes. Most of these values are low only in the context of farm population fertility. The lowest index--and the only one below 100--was 93, for women living in Northern and Western farm-operator households where off-farm work was performed in 1949 by some family member but none by the operator himself. The ratio in similar white households of the South was 115. This is undoubtedly the class of farm households where off-farm employment of women is most frequently found. The fertility ratios of ever-married women in such households were not exceptionally low but the proportion of unmarried women was high. Other low indexes occurred among women living on part-time or abnormal farms in the North and West (130), on fully-owned farms in the North and West (142), and among white women on economic class I, II, and III farms (as a group) in the South (144). The replacement index for the total population of the United States for the period April 1945 to April 1950 was about 125.

DEFINITIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Coverage. --The data in this report relate to the population living in the households of farm operators at the time of the 1950 Censuses of Population and Agriculture. Households were included in the sample regardless of whether they resided on the farm operated. But information was not tabulated for the households of 38,937 farm operators not residing on the farm operated and not living in the enumeration district in which the farm was located. The cost of locating schedules for these cases was prohibitive.

The number of children under 5 years old was not tabulated for farm-operator households. Therefore it was necessary to use data on children under 5 years old in farm-operator families and to relate them to women in farm-operator households. The number of children excluded is thought to amount to about 1 percent of all children. To this extent the fertility ratios are understated.

Farm operator. --A farm operator is a person who operates a farm, either performing the labor himself or directly supervising it. He may be an owner, hired manager, or tenant. In the case of an operating partnership only one partner was designated as an operator. Thus, the number of farm operators is considered the same as the number of farms.

Farm. --For the 1950 Census of Agriculture, places of 3 or more acres were counted as farms if the value of agricultural products produced in 1949, exclusive of home gardens, amounted to $150 or more. The products could have been either for home use or for sale. Places of less than 3 acres were counted as farms only if the value of agricultural products sold in 1949 amounted to $150 or more. Places operated in 1949 for which the value of agricultural products in 1949 was less than these minima because of crop failure or other unusual conditions, and places operated in 1950 for the first time, were counted as farms if normally they could be expected to produce these minimum quantities of farm products.

Household.--A household includes all the persons who occupy a house, an apartment or other group of rooms, or a room that constitutes a dwelling unit. It includes related family members and also the unrelated persons, if any, such as lodgers, foster children, or employees, who share the dwelling unit. A group of unrelated persons living in one dwelling unit as partners or a person living alone is also counted as a household.

Age.--The age classification is age at last birthday as of the date of enumeration. The figures on total women include a very small number of women whose age was unknown; these women were assumed to be single in marital status, and were distributed proportionately among the various age groups.

Marital status.--This report classifies women as single or ever married. Single means never married. The category "ever married" comprises women who are married, widowed, or divorced.

Color.--Color refers to the division of the population into two groups, white and nonwhite. The nonwhite group includes Negroes, Indians, Chinese, Japanese, Filipinos, and other nonwhite races.

Region.--The South as used in this report is comprised of the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. All other States comprise the North and West combined.

Ratio of children to women.--Ratios of children to women by age of woman--often called "fertility ratios"--are based largely on tabulations for households containing only one woman ever married. It was assumed that this woman was the mother of all children in the family. In households containing two or more women ever married the distribution of children by age of mother was estimated indirectly from the age-specific distribution in households having only one woman ever married. About 306,000 children under 5 years of age, or 17 percent of all children this age, were in households containing two or more women ever married. There were 35,114 children under 5 years found in households where the only woman ever married was 50 years old or over. Few such cases represented actual mother-child relationships. Therefore, these children, amounting to 1.8 percent of all children in households having only one woman ever married, were allocated proportionately to women of other age groups, with such control totals available as economic class of farm and type of farm.

Standardization for age.--A fertility ratio standardized for age shows what the ratio for a group of women would be if these women had the same distribution with respect to age as a selected standard population. As substantial differences are found between groups of farm women in their distribution by age, standardized ratios permit fertility comparisons between groups with confidence that observed fertility differentials are not attributable to variations among groups of women in age distribution.

The standard population chosen was that of women in all United States farm-operator households, by pertinent marital status (total women or women ever married). Thus for such women the unstandardized and standardized values are identical. Most of the tables were standardized by the direct method. In these cases fertility ratios were available by five-year age groups of women (unpublished). These ratios for a given group were multiplied by the standard proportion of women in that age. The sum of the products over the whole age range was the age-standardized ratio. For one table and parts of others the indirect method was necessary. Here the age-specific fertility ratios were not available. They were approximated in each instance through a procedure utilizing the age-specific ratios of the standard population.

Replacement index.--The replacement index signifies the number of children a group of women would bear during the course of their lives in relation to the number required to replace the parent population, if the women were subject to the age-specific fertility and mortality rates through life which prevailed at the time studied. An index of 100 implies that the women would bear exactly enough children to replace the population in the succeeding generation. Indexes of more than 100 imply a potentially growing population. The difference between the value of such an index and 100 may be interpreted as the percentage increase eventually expected in the population during the course of a generation. The length of a generation may vary somewhat from one population to another, depending upon the average age at which women bear children.

In deriving the replacement index a replacement quota is first obtained of the number of children under 5 years old per 1,000 women 15 to 49 years old in a current life table applicable to the population studied. In this report the United States life table for 1947 was used. Separate quotas were computed for white and nonwhite women. At the regional level, quotas for total women were adjusted to account for varying regional proportions of women by color. The age-specific fertility ratios of each subclass of women studied are cross multiplied by the life table age distribution of women (expressed in percentage form) and summed. The resulting sum is the fertility ratio of the subclass had it the life table age distribution. This ratio is divided by the appropriate replacement quota; the quotient of this division being the replacement index.

The replacement index, like the fertility ratios which go into it, is affected by underenumeration in the census. It seems reasonable to assume that the indexes shown represent minimal values for the period measured. Were the data available, a replacement index could be constructed based on the male population in farm-operator households. Such an index would, in most instances, show somewhat lower values than that based on the female population even if the mean length of a generation for men were no longer than that for women. The lower replacement indexes would result from the fact that there are generally more men than women in the farm population. In particular there is an excess of single men. While male replacement indexes would be lower than female, it is not likely that many of them--if indeed any--would have been below 100 for the farm population from 1945 to 1950.

Underenumeration.--In the Census of Population the number of young children is known to be understated. This results from undercounting, misstatements of age, and the aging during the enumeration period of the children to be enumerated. The net underenumeration of children under 5 years in the 1950 Census is estimated at 802,000[15] or 4.7 percent of the "true" number at that age. The problem is judged worse in the enumeration of farm children. But no suitable means of adjusting the child population in farm-operator households for this defect exists, let alone any possibility of making meaningful adjustments for subgroups in this population. Therefore, fertility ratios given include no adjustments for underenumeration.

The effect of differential underenumeration among classes of the farm population is probably to minimize fertility differences rather than to exaggerate them. Usually the highest fertility ratios are found among groups who rank low in measures of social and economic status, such as income or education, and among nonwhite populations. These are also the populations known to have the highest relative underenumeration of children.[16] Thus the count of children among farm women of low or average fertility is probably more complete than that of women of high fertility. It has also been learned in recent years that the underenumeration of very young children is frequently associated with the missing of entire families.[17] For this reason, adjustment for underenumeration of children without similar adjustment for adults would result in overstatement of fertility ratios.

---

[15] Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 121. September 27, 1955. Page 4.

[16] Bureau of the Census, Infant Enumeration Study: 1950. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1953. Tables 2, 7, and 8.

Economic class of farm.--The tabulations of the 1950 Census of Agriculture utilized a 9-fold economic classification of farms, based with three exceptions on the value of products sold from the farm in 1949. The nine classes are grouped into two major groups--commercial farms and other farms. All farms with a value of sales of $1,200 or more are termed commercial, with the exception of so-called "abnormal" farms. Farms selling smaller amounts may be either commercial, part-time, or residential, depending upon value of sales, and the amount of off-farm work or nonfarm income.

The class definitions follow:

Class	Value of farm products sold in 1949
Commercial farms	
Class I	$25,000 or more
Class II	10,000 to 24,999
Class III	5,000 to 9,999
Class IV	2,500 to 4,999
Class V	1,200 to 2,499
Class VI	250 to 1,199*
	*Provided farm operator worked off-farm less than 100 days in 1949 and nonfarm family income was less than value of farm products sold.
Other farms	
Part-time	$1,200 to 2,499**
	**Provided farm operator worked off-farm 100 days or more in 1949 or nonfarm family income exceeded value of farm products sold.
Residential	Less than $250
Abnormal	Public and private institutional farms, community farms, experiment stations, etc., insofar as possible to identify them, without regard to value of sales.

Dependence on agriculture.--The categories of degree of dependence on agriculture derive from the relation between three variables--value of farm products sold, off-farm work, and nonfarm income. The value of farm products sold represents the approximate gross cash income from operation of the farm. Crop sales are recorded for the crop year preceding the census and represent crops as yet to be sold as well as those already sold. Livestock sales are for the calendar year preceding the census regardless of when the livestock were raised or fattened. As with unsold crops, the sales value of unsold clipped wool and mohair is estimated.

Off-farm work by the operator or his family includes work at nonfarm jobs, businesses, or professions, whether performed on the farm premises or elsewhere; also work on someone else's farm for pay or wages. Exchange work is not included.

Nonfarm income includes income for off-farm work, sale of products from land rented out, cash rent, boarders, old age assistance, pensions, veteran's allowances, interest, dividends, unemployment compensation, and help from other family members.

---

[17] Ibid. Table 9.

Total family income.--Income is the sum of money received by the family from wages or salaries, net income or loss from self-employment in a farm, business, or profession, and income other than earnings. This last category includes net income or loss from rents, receipts from boarders, royalties, interest, dividends, pensions, estate and trust funds, annuities, veteran's allowances, armed forces allotments or other government assistance, and contributions from persons not members of the household. Figures represent income received before income tax, social security, or other withholdings.

Receipts from the following sources are not included as income: Value of income in kind, such as food produced and consumed at home, and free living quarters; withdrawals of bank deposits; borrowed money; tax refunds; gifts; lump-sum inheritances or insurance payments; money received from sale of property such as stocks, a house, or a car, unless the recipient was engaged in the business of selling such property.

Type of farm.--The classification of farms by type was made on the basis of the relationship of the value of sales from a particular source or group of sources to the total value of all farm products sold from the farm. With the exception of dairy and general farms, the type represents a product or group of products which accounts for 50 percent or more of the total value of products sold.

Type of farm	Product or group of products included
Cash grain ------------------	Corn, sorghum, small grains (wheat, oats, barley, flax, rice), field peas, field beans, cowpeas, and soybeans.
Cotton ---------------------	Cotton.
Other field crops-------------	Peanuts, Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, tobacco, sugarcane, sugar beets for sugar, popcorn, broomcorn, hops, and other miscellaneous crops.
Vegetable ------------------	Vegetables.
Fruit-and-nut --------------	Berries and other small fruits, and tree fruits and nuts.
Dairy---------------------	Milk and other dairy products. The criterion of 50 percent of total sales was modified in the case of dairy farms. A farm was classified as dairy if: (a) Dairy products accounted for 30 percent or more of the total value of products sold, and (b) Milk cows represented 50 percent or more of all cows, and (c) Sales of dairy products, together with sales of cattle and calves, amounted to 50 percent or more of total farm sales.
Poultry --------------------	Chickens, eggs, turkeys, and other poultry products.
Livestock farms other than dairy and poultry ---------	Cattle, calves, hogs, sheep, goats, wool, mohair, goat milk, and products from animals slaughtered on the farm, provided the farm did not already qualify as a dairy farm.

General	Farms where the value of products from one source or group of sources did not represent 50 percent or more of the total value of farm products sold.
Miscellaneous	Horticultural products; forest products; bees, wax, and honey; horses; fur animals.

Tenure of farm. --Farm operators are classified according to the tenure under which they hold their land.

Full owners	Own land but do not rent land from others.
Part owners	Own land and rent land from others.
Managers	Operate farm for others for a wage or salary. Does not include caretakers or laborers.
Tenants	Rent from others or work on shares for others all the land they operate.
Cash tenants	Rent land from others for cash only.
Share-cash tenants	Pay a part of their rent in cash and part as a share of the crops or livestock products they raise.
Share tenants	Pay their rent as a share of the crops or livestock products they raise, or a share of both.
Croppers	Are tenants who pay their rent with a share of crops, and whose landlords furnish all the work power. Croppers usually work under the close supervision of the landlord or his agent and the land assigned them is often merely a part of a larger enterprise operated by the landlord as a single unit.

SOURCE AND RELIABILITY OF DATA

Source of data. --The data in this report represent a segment of a larger study undertaken cooperatively by the Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, and the former Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics and former Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. The major body of findings was reported in a joint publication of these agencies in 1953, entitled Farms and Farm People.

The data are estimates based on a sample of about 11,000 farms and their associated farm-operator households and families enumerated in the 1950 Censuses of Agriculture and Population. This represents about .2 percent of all farms in the United States in 1950. The data were obtained by matching individual reports from the two censuses. The sample was taken from 5,260 enumeration districts, or 5 percent of the enumeration districts having farms. Within these districts the sample comprised about 4 percent of the farms and associated households. In each instance the farms were selected by taking those farms for which the sample questions of the Census of Agriculture were answered and whose household head had been asked the sample questions of the Census of Population. Separate estimates were made for large farms and for all other farms. These two groups were separately weighted, by region, to obtain inflated sample totals.

Reliability of the estimates. --The data are subject to sampling variability. Table C indicates approximate standard errors according to the magnitude of an estimate. The chances are about 2 out of 3 that the estimate of an absolute number would differ from the total that would have been obtained from a tabulation of all farms and farm-operator households by less than the standard error. The chances are about 19 out of 20 that the difference would be less than twice the standard error, and 99 out of 100 that it would be less than 2 1/2 times the standard error.

TABLE C.--Standard error of estimated numbers, for the United States and regions

(Range of 2 chances out of 3)

Estimated number	United States		North and West		South	
	Standard error	Percent of estimate	Standard error	Percent of estimate	Standard error	Percent of estimate
10,000	2,200	22.0	2,200	22.0	2,200	22.0
25,000	3,500	14.0	3,500	14.0	3,500	14.0
50,000	5,000	10.0	5,000	10.0	5,000	10.0
100,000	7,000	7.0	7,000	7.0	7,000	7.0
250,000	10,000	4.0	10,600	4.2	10,700	4.3
500,000	15,100	3.0	14,000	2.8	14,300	2.9
1,000,000	20,200	2.0	16,800	1.7	17,700	1.8
1,250,000	22,000	1.8	16,800	1.3	18,200	1.5
1,500,000	23,300	1.6	16,000	1.1	18,100	1.2
2,000,000	25,100	1.3	10,900	0.5	15,700	0.8
2,500,000	26,000	1.0	--	--	8,500	0.3
3,000,000	25,900	0.9	--	--	--	--
4,000,000	22,700	0.6	--	--	--	--
5,000,000	13,400	0.3	--	--	--	--

The sampling variability of fertility ratios, either unstandardized or standardized, cannot be presented in a simple table. The variability depends on the size of the rate, the number of women in the base, and the variability in the distribution of these women by number of children.

TABLE 1.--Summary: Women 15 to 49 years old in farm-operator households by number of children under 5 years old, by marital status, color, and age of woman, for the United States and regions, 1950

(Rate not shown where base less than 160,000)

Area, age, and color	Women			Children under 5 years old				
					Per 1,000-			
					Total women		Ever married women	
	Total	Ever married	Single	Total	Unstandardized	Age standardized	Unstandardized	Age standardized
UNITED STATES	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*
Total, 15 to 49 years	4,811,082	3,649,552	1,161,530	2,324,569	483	483	637	637
15 to 19 years	919,781	119,757	800,024	71,034	77		--	
20 to 24 years	558,058	392,736	165,322	462,169	828		1,177	
25 to 29 years	652,528	592,572	59,956	658,084	1,009		1,111	
30 to 34 years	684,435	641,150	43,285	505,585	739		789	
35 to 39 years	741,291	707,996	33,295	382,474	516		540	
40 to 44 years	653,063	621,864	31,199	181,564	278		292	
45 to 49 years	601,926	573,477	28,449	63,659	106		111	
White, 15 to 49 years	4,137,726	3,168,300	969,426	1,894,921	458	458	598	606
15 to 19 years	752,554	91,353	661,201	50,498	67		--	
20 to 24 years	455,062	322,096	132,966	365,018	802		1,133	
25 to 29 years	555,247	503,029	52,218	552,656	995		1,099	
30 to 34 years	608,871	568,949	39,922	427,625	702		752	
35 to 39 years	653,166	622,110	31,056	313,461	480		504	
40 to 44 years	578,444	555,449	22,995	140,423	243		253	
45 to 49 years	534,382	505,314	29,068	45,240	85		90	
Nonwhite, 15 to 49 years	673,356	481,252	192,104	429,648	638	656	893	856
NORTH								
Total, 15 to 49 years	1,866,425	1,437,509	428,916	864,010	463	451	601	607
WEST								
Total, 15 to 49 years	374,647	300,613	74,034	170,200	454	448	566	597
NORTH and WEST								
Total, 15 to 49 years	2,241,072	1,738,122	502,950	1,034,210	461	451	595	605
15 to 19 years	365,494	33,338	332,156	19,231	53		--	
20 to 24 years	234,213	162,531	71,682	172,792	738		1,063	
25 to 29 years	322,640	289,065	33,575	314,185	974		1,087	
30 to 34 years	335,103	312,949	22,154	246,447	735		787	
35 to 39 years	369,288	349,968	19,320	183,385	497		524	
40 to 44 years	313,851	300,623	13,228	72,660	232		242	
45 to 49 years	300,483	289,648	10,835	25,510	85		88	
SOUTH								
Total, 15 to 49 years	2,570,010	1,911,430	658,580	1,290,359	502	510	675	664
15 to 19 years	554,287	86,419	467,868	52,191	94		--	
20 to 24 years	323,845	230,205	93,640	290,420	897		1,262	
25 to 29 years	329,888	303,507	26,381	342,440	1,038		1,128	
30 to 34 years	349,332	328,201	21,131	259,626	743		791	
35 to 39 years	372,003	358,028	13,975	199,401	536		557	
40 to 44 years	339,212	321,241	17,971	108,394	320		337	
45 to 49 years	301,443	283,829	17,614	37,887	126		133	
White, 15 to 49 years	1,915,289	1,443,938	471,351	872,250	455	466	604	606
15 to 19 years	390,464	58,015	332,449	31,655	81		--	
20 to 24 years	224,702	162,722	61,980	198,230	882		1,218	
25 to 29 years	237,185	217,088	20,097	239,368	1,009		1,103	
30 to 34 years	275,862	258,243	17,619	183,958	667		712	
35 to 39 years	285,673	273,187	12,486	131,175	459		480	
40 to 44 years	265,707	256,388	9,319	68,396	257		267	
45 to 49 years	235,697	218,295	17,401	19,468	83		89	
Nonwhite, 15 to 49 years	654,721	467,492	187,229	418,109	639	660	894	860

TABLE 2.--Economic class of farm: Women 15 to 49 years old in farm-operator households by number of children under 5 years old, by marital status for the United States and regions, with color for the South, 1950

(Rate not shown where base less than 160,000)

Area and color of woman, and economic class of farm	Women			Children under 5 years old				
					Per 1,000-			
					Total women		Ever married women	
	Total	Ever married	Single	Total	Unstandardized	Age standardized	Unstandardized	Age standardized
UNITED STATES								
	Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*
Total, 15 to 49 years	4,811,082	3,649,552	1,161,530	2,324,569	483	483	637	637
Commercial farms	3,359,326	2,572,876	786,450	1,658,263	494	493	645	642
Classes I and II	458,356	366,396	91,960	206,224	450	432	563	564
Class III	695,699	550,096	145,603	332,210	478	468	604	608
Class IV	830,436	621,085	209,351	388,838	468	464	626	626
Class V	819,866	623,195	196,671	422,511	515	517	678	666
Class VI	554,969	412,104	142,865	308,480	556	580	749	742
Other farms	1,451,756	1,076,676	375,080	666,306	459	461	619	625
Part-time or abnormal	599,969	451,880	148,089	256,011	427	425	567	572
Residential	851,787	624,796	226,991	410,295	482	488	657	666
NORTH and WEST								
Total, 15 to 49 years	2,241,072	1,738,122	502,950	1,034,210	461	451	595	605
Commercial farms	1,727,788	1,351,375	376,413	822,523	476	460	609	611
Classes I and II	366,121	292,576	73,545	171,587	469	453	586	591
Class III	539,162	428,585	110,577	270,635	502	472	631	620
Class IV	458,488	355,638	102,850	213,957	467	456	602	609
Class V	275,332	211,675	63,657	128,754	468	449	608	604
Class VI	88,685	62,901	25,784	37,590	--	--	--	--
Other farms	513,284	386,747	126,537	211,687	412	415	547	579
Part-time or abnormal	250,650	189,683	60,967	92,425	369	374	487	522
Residential	262,634	197,064	65,570	119,262	454	454	605	637
SOUTH								
Total, 15 to 49 years	2,570,010	1,911,430	658,580	1,290,359	502	510	675	664
Commercial farms	1,631,538	1,221,501	410,037	835,740	512	525	684	672
Classes I and II	92,235	73,820	18,415	34,637	387	414	493	521
Class III	156,537	121,511	35,026	61,575				
Class IV	371,948	265,447	106,501	174,881	470	473	659	643
Class V	544,534	411,520	133,014	293,757	539	551	714	694
Class VI	466,284	349,203	117,081	270,890	581	604	776	762
Other farms	938,472	689,929	248,543	454,619	484	485	659	649
Part-time or abnormal	349,319	262,197	87,122	163,586	468	459	624	607
Residential	589,153	427,732	161,421	291,033	494	501	680	676
White, 15 to 49 years	1,915,289	1,443,938	471,351	872,250	455	466	604	606
Commercial farms	1,171,726	(1)	(1)	532,825	455	470	(1)	(1)
Classes I and II	87,896	(1)	(1)	34,637	400	411	(1)	(1)
Class III	138,247	(1)	(1)	55,850				
Class IV	294,810	(1)	(1)	130,697	443	439	(1)	(1)
Class V	378,077	(1)	(1)	176,459	467	481	(1)	(1)
Class VI	272,696	(1)	(1)	135,182	496	541	(1)	(1)
Other farms	743,563	(1)	(1)	339,425	456	459	(1)	(1)
Part-time or abnormal	285,886	(1)	(1)	129,396	453	443	(1)	(1)
Residential	457,677	(1)	(1)	210,029	459	469	(1)	(1)
Nonwhite, 15 to 49 years	654,721	467,492	187,229	418,109	639	660	894	860
Commercial farms	459,685	(1)	(1)	302,915	659	673	(1)	(1)
Classes I, II, III, IV	99,936	(1)	(1)	49,909	--	--	(1)	(1)
Class V	166,377	(1)	(1)	117,298	705	706	(1)	(1)
Class VI	193,372	(1)	(1)	135,708	702	705	(1)	(1)
Other farms	195,036	(1)	(1)	115,194	591	578	(1)	(1)
Part-time or abnormal	63,506	(1)	(1)	34,190	--	--	(1)	(1)
Residential	131,530	(1)	(1)	81,004	--	--	(1)	(1)

---

[1] Data not available.

TABLE 3.--Degree of dependence on agriculture in 1949: Women 15 to 49 years old in farm-operator households by number of children under 5 years old, by marital status for the United States and regions, with color for the South, 1950

(Rate not shown where base less than 160,000)

Area and color of woman and degree of dependence on agriculture	Women			Children under 5 years old				
	Total	Ever married	Single	Total	Per 1,000-			
					Total women		Ever married women	
					Unstandardized	Age standardized	Unstandardized	Age standardized
UNITED STATES	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*
Total, 15 to 49 years-------	4,811,082	3,649,552	1,161,530	2,324,569	483	483	637	637
Operator's family--								
Without nonfarm income--------	1,714,636	1,309,404	405,232	850,925	496	501	650	653
With nonfarm income-----------	2,909,007	2,204,651	704,356	1,387,107	477	471	629	624
Value of farm sales greater than nonfarm income-------	1,355,316	1,039,824	315,492	676,774	499	493	651	641
Value of farm sales less than nonfarm income-------	1,553,691	1,164,827	388,864	710,333	457	451	610	610
With no off-farm work---------	2,112,560	1,639,554	473,006	1,118,040	529	515	682	659
Without nonfarm income------	1,714,636	1,309,404	405,232	850,925	496	501	650	653
With nonfarm income---------	397,924	330,150	67,774	267,115	671	564	809	679
With no off-farm work by operator but some by family member-----------------------	466,374	284,896	181,478	149,969	322	349	526	590
With off-farm work by operator	2,044,709	1,589,605	455,104	970,023	474	474	610	616
Value of farm sales greater than nonfarm income-------	826,220	658,307	167,913	440,782	533	524	670	655
Value of farm sales less than nonfarm income-------	1,218,489	931,298	287,191	529,241	434	440	568	587
Days worked by operator--								
1 to 49-------------------	546,845	425,333	121,512	289,906	530	527	682	671
50 to 199-----------------	574,482	438,065	136,417	271,692	473	473	620	617
200 or more---------------	923,382	726,207	197,175	408,425	442	445	562	581
Other or not reported---------	187,439	135,497	51,942	86,537	462	509	--	--
NORTH and WEST								
Total, 15 to 49 years-------	2,241,072	1,738,122	502,950	1,034,210	461	451	595	605
Operator's family--								
Without nonfarm income--------	823,268	654,209	169,059	396,611	482	466	606	612
With nonfarm income-----------	1,318,267	1,008,103	310,164	592,748	450	442	588	598
Value of farm sales greater than nonfarm income-------	676,836	523,122	153,714	322,029	476	463	616	611
Value of farm sales less than nonfarm income-------	641,431	484,981	156,450	270,719	422	419	558	583
With no off-farm work---------	980,831	780,665	200,166	499,642	509	483	640	626
Without nonfarm income------	823,268	654,209	169,059	396,611	482	466	606	612
With nonfarm income---------	157,563	126,456	31,107	103,031	--	--	--	--
With no off-farm work by operator but some by family member-----------------------	206,072	121,770	84,302	50,029	243	267	--	--
With off-farm work by operator	954,632	759,877	194,755	439,688	461	453	579	592
Value of farm sales greater than nonfarm income-------	402,736	330,759	71,977	209,093	519	493	632	616
Value of farm sales less than nonfarm income-------	551,896	429,118	122,778	230,595	418	422	537	570
Days worked by operator--								
1-49----------------------	275,811	220,531	55,280	132,632	481	460	601	586
50-199--------------------	229,878	181,128	48,750	115,160	501	493	636	638
200 or more---------------	448,943	358,218	90,725	191,896	427	427	536	569
Other or not reported---------	99,537	75,810	23,727	44,851	--	--	--	--
SOUTH								
Total, 15 to 49 years-------	2,570,010	1,911,430	658,580	1,290,359	502	510	675	664
Operator's family--								
Without nonfarm income--------	891,368	655,195	236,173	454,314	510	537	693	693
With nonfarm income-----------	1,590,740	1,196,548	394,192	794,359	499	495	664	646
Value of farm sales greater than nonfarm income-------	678,480	516,702	161,778	354,745	523	526	687	670
Value of farm sales less than nonfarm income-------	912,260	679,846	232,414	439,614	482	473	647	627

TABLE 3.--Continued

Area and color of woman and degree of dependence on agriculture	Women			Children under 5 years old				
					Per 1,000-			
					Total women		Ever married women	
	Total	Ever married	Single	Total	Unstandardized	Age standardized	Unstandardized	Age standardized
SOUTH--Continued								
Operator's family--Continued	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*
With no off-farm work----------	1,131,729	858,889	272,840	618,398	546	543	720	688
Without nonfarm income-------	891,368	655,195	236,173	454,314	510	537	693	693
With nonfarm income----------	240,361	203,694	36,667	164,084	683	565	806	673
With no off-farm work by operator but some by family member-----------------------	260,302	163,126	97,176	99,940	384	412	613	642
With off-farm work by operator	1,090,077	829,728	260,349	530,335	487	496	639	638
Value of farm sales greater than nonfarm income--------	423,484	327,548	95,936	231,689	547	557	707	692
Value of farm sales less than nonfarm income--------	666,593	502,180	164,413	298,646	448	456	595	602
Days worked by operator------								
1 to 49--------------------	271,034	204,802	66,232	157,274	580	601	768	762
50 to 199------------------	344,604	256,937	87,667	156,532	454	458	609	602
200 or more----------------	474,439	367,989	106,450	216,529	456	463	588	593
Other or not reported----------	87,902	59,687	28,215	41,686	--	--	--	--
White, 15 to 49 years--------	1,915,289	1,443,938	471,351	872,250	455	466	604	605
Operator's family--								
Without nonfarm income---------	590,259	442,907	147,352	264,287	448	476	597	616
With nonfarm income------------	1,259,335	954,494	304,841	578,916	460	460	607	599
Value of farm sales greater than nonfarm income--------	494,325	375,424	118,901	230,486	466	473	614	610
Value of farm sales less than nonfarm income--------	765,010	579,070	185,940	348,430	455	451	602	591
With no off-farm work----------	803,038	626,613	176,425	408,306	508	501	652	626
Without nonfarm income-------	590,259	442,907	147,352	264,287	448	476	597	616
With nonfarm income----------	212,799	183,706	29,073	144,019	677	558	784	646
With no off-farm work by operator but some by family member-----------------------	200,120	127,945	72,175	60,983	305	330	--	--
With off-farm work by operator	846,436	642,843	203,593	373,914	442	459	582	598
Value of farm sales greater than nonfarm income--------	290,069	219,718	70,351	140,616	485	507	640	648
Value of farm sales less than nonfarm income--------	556,367	423,125	133,242	233,298	419	433	551	573
Days worked by operator--								
1 to 49--------------------	189,245	140,630	48,615	92,527	489	527	--	--
50 to 199------------------	251,276	185,401	65,875	103,351	411	418	557	565
200 or more----------------	405,915	316,812	89,103	178,036	439	453	562	582
Other or not reported----------	65,695	46,537	19,158	29,047	--	--	--	--
Nonwhite, 15 to 49 years-----	654,721	467,492	187,229	418,109	639	643	894	833
Operator's family--								
Without nonfarm income---------	301,109	212,288	88,821	190,027	631	651	895	841
With nonfarm income------------	331,405	242,054	89,351	215,443	650	635	890	819
Value of farm sales greater than nonfarm income--------	184,155	141,278	42,877	124,259	675	664	--	--
Value of farm sales less than nonfarm income--------	147,250	100,776	46,474	91,184	--	--	--	--

TABLE 3.—Continued

Area and color of woman and degree of dependence on agriculture	Women			Children under 5 years old				
					Per 1,000-			
					Total women		Ever married women	
	Total	Ever married	Single	Total	Unstandardized	Age standardized	Unstandardized	Age standardized
Operator's family--Continued								
With no off-farm work----------	328,691	232,276	96,415	210,092	639	653	904	851
Without nonfarm income-------	301,109	212,288	88,821	190,027	631	651	895	841
With nonfarm income----------	27,582	19,988	7,594	20,065	--	--	--	--
With no off-farm work by operator but some by family member----------------------	60,182	35,181	25,001	38,957	--	--	--	--
With off-farm work by operator	243,641	186,885	56,756	156,421	642	615	837	762
Value of farm sales greater than nonfarm income--------	133,415	107,830	25,585	91,073	--	--	--	--
Value of farm sales less than nonfarm income--------	110,226	79,055	31,171	65,348	--	--	--	--
Days worked by operator--								
1 to 49--------------------	81,789	64,172	17,617	64,747	--	--	--	--
50 to 199------------------	93,328	71,536	21,792	53,181	566	539	--	--
200 or more----------------	68,524	51,177	17,347	38,493			--	--
Other or not reported----------	22,207	13,150	9,057	12,639	--	--	--	--

TABLE 4.--Total family income in 1949: Women 15 to 49 years old, ever married, in farm-operator households, by number of children under 5 years old, for the United States and regions, 1950

(Rate not shown where base less than 160,000)

Area of woman and total family income in 1949	Women ever married	Children under 5 years old		
			Per 1,000 women	
		Total	Un-standardized	Age standardized
UNITED STATES	*Number*	*Number*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*
Total, 15 to 49 years------------------------------------	3,649,552	2,324,569	637	637
Under $500--	388,847	282,582	727	721
$500 to $999--	419,317	288,876	689	708
$1,000 to $1,499--	432,046	296,836	687	664
$1,500 to $2,499--	780,291	514,429	659	631
$2,500 to $3,499--	543,125	325,026	598	596
$3,500 to $4,499--	329,049	180,467	548	582
$4,500 to $5,999--	226,217	119,321	527	566
$6,000 and over---	244,689	124,994	511	562
Not reported--	285,971	192,038	672	708
NORTH and WEST				
Total, 15 to 49 years------------------------------------	1,738,122	1,034,210	595	604
Under $1,000--	166,688	89,025	534	565
$1,000 to $1,499--	155,924	104,629	--	--
$1,500 to $2,499--	404,567	256,923	635	617
$2,500 to $3,499--	334,951	207,345	619	613
$3,500 to $4,499--	228,827	126,026	551	565
$4,500 to $5,999--	157,184	85,112	--	--
$6,000 and over---	169,611	93,530	551	606
Not reported--	120,370	71,620	--	--
SOUTH				
Total, 15 to 49 years------------------------------------	1,911,430	1,290,359	675	664
Under $500--	327,947	254,503	776	760
$500 to $999--	313,529	225,003	718	729
$1,000 to $1,499--	276,122	192,044	696	676
$1,500 to $2,499--	375,724	257,894	686	647
$2,500 to $3,499--	208,174	117,906	566	560
$3,500 and over---	244,333	122,900	503	542
Not reported--	165,601	120,109	725	764

TABLE 5.--Type of farm: Women 15 to 49 years old in farm-operator households by number of children under 5 years old, by marital status for the United States and regions, with color for the South, 1950

(Commercial farms only. Rate not shown where base less than 160,000)

Area and color of woman, and type of farm	Women			Children under 5 years old				
	Total	Ever married	Single	Total	Per 1,000-			
					Total women		Ever married women	
					Unstandardized	Age standardized	Unstandardized	Age standardized
UNITED STATES	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*
Total, 15 to 49 years	3,359,326	2,572,876	786,450	1,658,263	494	493	645	642
Field crops, except vegetables, fruits, or nuts	1,502,561	1,140,194	362,367	809,073	538	546	710	692
Cash grain	376,298	306,699	69,599	188,935	502	477	616	602
Cotton	693,859	523,134	170,725	373,498	538	559	714	702
Other (mostly tobacco)	432,404	310,361	122,043	246,640	570	583	795	762
Dairy	532,259	409,560	122,699	252,111	474	459	616	611
Livestock, including poultry	740,044	584,873	155,171	335,286	453	445	573	580
General farming	444,628	341,128	103,500	215,341	484	482	631	645
Vegetables, fruits, nuts, and miscellaneous	139,834	97,121	42,713	46,452	--	--	--	--
NORTH and WEST								
Total, 15 to 49 years	1,727,788	1,351,375	376,413	822,523	476	461	609	611
Field crops, except vegetables, fruits, or nuts	365,244	292,671	72,573	182,259	499	480	623	616
Cash grain	317,348	256,259	61,089	156,628	494	470	611	601
Dairy	439,340	336,784	102,556	224,139	510	495	666	655
Livestock, including poultry	546,024	437,794	108,230	253,934	465	447	580	584
General farming	280,173	217,856	62,317	135,079	482	461	620	624
Vegetables, fruits, nuts, and miscellaneous	97,007	66,270	30,737	27,112	--	--	--	--
SOUTH								
Total, 15 to 49 years	1,631,538	1,221,501	410,037	835,740	512	525	684	672
Field crops, except vegetables, fruits, or nuts	1,137,317	847,523	289,794	626,814	551	566	740	718
Cotton	674,926	507,008	167,918	362,386	537	559	715	703
Other (mostly tobacco)	403,441	290,075	113,366	232,121	575	587	800	766
Dairy	92,919	72,776	20,143	27,972	--	--	--	--
Livestock, including poultry	194,020	147,079	46,941	81,352	419	434	--	--
General farming	164,455	123,272	41,183	80,262	488	513	--	--
Vegetables, fruits, nuts, and miscellaneous	42,827	30,851	11,976	19,340	--	--	--	--
White, 15 to 49 years[1]	1,173,699	(2)	(2)	532,825	454	469	(2)	(2)
Field crops, except vegetables, fruits, or nuts	713,691	(2)	(2)	351,716	493	509	(2)	(2)
Cotton	371,024	(2)	(2)	170,396	459	484	(2)	(2)
Other (mostly tobacco)	286,020	(2)	(2)	151,117	528	544	(2)	(2)
Dairy or livestock, including poultry	276,253	(2)	(2)	106,229	385	386	(2)	(2)
General farming	148,758	(2)	(2)	63,430	--	--	(2)	(2)
Vegetables, fruits, nuts, and miscellaneous	34,997	(2)	(2)	11,450	--	--	(2)	(2)
Nonwhite, 15 to 49 years[1]	457,839	(2)	(2)	302,915	662	676	(2)	(2)
Field crops, except vegetables, fruits, or nuts	423,626	(2)	(2)	275,098	649	667	(2)	(2)
Cotton	303,902	(2)	(2)	191,990	632	658	(2)	(2)
Other (mostly tobacco)	117,421	(2)	(2)	81,004	--	--	(2)	(2)
All other types	34,213	(2)	(2)	27,817	--	--	(2)	(2)

---

[1] The number of women by color in the South is partly estimated. The totals by color for all commercial farms differ slightly from those in table 3.

[2] Data not available.

TABLE 6.--Tenure of farm operator: Women 15 to 49 years old in farm-operator households by number of children under 5 years old, by marital status for the United States and regions with color for the South, 1950

(Rate not shown where base less than 160,000)

Area and color of woman and tenure of farm operator	Women			Children under 5 years old				
					Per 1,000--			
					Total women		Ever married women	
	Total	Ever married	Single	Total[1]	Unstandardized	Age standardized	Unstandardized	Age standardized
UNITED STATES								
	Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*
Total, 15 to 49 years--------	4,811,082	3,649,552	1,161,530	2,331,488	485	485	639	639
Full owner----------------------	2,457,099	1,783,909	673,190	971,902	396	426	545	601
Commercial--------------------	(2)	1,000,606	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	532	604
Noncommercial-----------------	(2)	783,303	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	561	601
Part owner or manager------------	842,595	653,808	188,787	387,886	460	454	593	607
Tenant--------------------------	1,511,388	1,211,835	299,553	971,700	643	586	802	713
Commercial--------------------	(2)	1,004,955	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	793	702
Noncommercial-----------------	(2)	206,880	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	846	769
Cash or share-cash------------	394,558	328,554	66,004	259,215	657	573	789	709
Share tenant------------------	983,619	781,570	202,049	642,719	653	607	822	733
Crop or livestock share------	570,672	456,347	114,325	369,307	647	602	809	727
Cropper---------------------	412,947	325,223	87,724	273,412	662	615	841	742
Other or not reported----------	133,211	105,919	27,292	69,766	--	--	--	--
NORTH and WEST								
Total, 15 to 49 years--------	2,241,072	1,738,122	502,950	1,025,349	458	447	590	600
Full owner----------------------	1,248,165	918,596	329,569	480,411	385	409	523	591
Commercial--------------------	(2)	591,894	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	532	611
Noncommercial-----------------	(2)	326,702	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	507	557
Part owner or manager------------	480,186	378,934	101,252	224,351	467	453	592	604
Tenant--------------------------	512,721	440,592	72,129	320,587	625	504	728	607
Commercial--------------------	(2)	406,921	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	719	595
Noncommercial-----------------	(2)	33,671	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	--	--
Cash or share-cash------------	233,663	200,271	33,392	142,025	608	512	709	634
Share tenant------------------	229,946	200,833	29,113	153,506	668	527	764	615
Other or not reported----------	49,112	39,488	9,624	25,056	--	--	--	--
SOUTH								
Total, 15 to 49 years--------	2,570,010	1,911,430	658,580	1,306,139	508	516	683	671
Full owner----------------------	1,208,934	865,313	343,621	491,491	407	442	568	609
Commercial--------------------	(2)	408,712	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	532	596
Noncommercial-----------------	(2)	456,601	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	600	632
Part owner or manager------------	362,409	274,874	87,535	163,535	451	455	595	609
Tenant--------------------------	998,667	771,243	227,424	651,113	652	628	844	772
Commercial--------------------	(2)	598,034	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	843	770
Noncommercial-----------------	(2)	173,209	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	849	773
Cash or share-cash------------	160,895	128,283	32,612	117,190	728	672	--	--
Share tenant------------------	753,673	580,737	172,936	489,213	649	630	842	770
Crop or livestock share------	340,726	255,514	85,212	215,801	633	648	845	807
Cropper---------------------	412,947	325,223	87,724	273,412	662	615	841	742
Other or not reported----------	84,099	66,431	17,668	44,710	--	--	--	--
White, 15 to 49 years[3]-------	1,919,131	1,451,612	467,519	876,195	457	466	604	607
Full owner----------------------	1,059,248	767,477	291,771	407,857	385	420	531	576
Commercial--------------------	(2)	362,424	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	507	571
Noncommercial-----------------	(2)	405,053	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	554	588
Part owner or manager------------	300,773	238,115	62,658	129,406	430	423	543	547
Tenant--------------------------	559,110	446,020	113,090	338,932	606	566	760	678
Commercial--------------------	(2)	341,346	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	749	672
Noncommercial-----------------	(2)	104,674	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	--	--
Cash or share-cash------------	105,665	86,729	18,936	78,266	--	--	--	--
Share tenant------------------	396,637	313,003	83,634	234,892	592	563	750	674
Crop or livestock share------	225,532	172,932	52,600	131,378	583	586	760	719
Cropper---------------------	171,105	140,071	31,034	103,514	605	533	--	--
Other or not reported----------	56,808	46,288	10,520	25,774	--	--	--	--
Nonwhite, 15 to 49 years[3]----	650,879	459,818	191,061	429,944	661	692	935	897

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 6.--Continued

Area and color of woman and tenure of farm operator	Women			Children under 5 years old				
					Per 1,000-			
					Total women		Ever married women	
	Total	Ever married	Single	Total[1]	Unstand-ardized	Age stand-ardized	Unstand-ardized	Age stand-ardized
SOUTH--Continued	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*	*Ratio*
Full owner------------------------	149,686	97,836	51,850	83,634	557	642	--	--
Part owner or manager------------	61,636	36,759	24,877	34,129				
Tenant----------------------------	439,557	325,223	114,334	312,181	710	718	960	903
Commercial----------------------	([2])	256,688	([2])	([2])	([2])	([2])	967	908
Noncommercial-------------------	([2])	68,535	([2])	([2])	([2])	([2])	--	--
Cash or share-cash--------------	55,230	41,554	13,676	38,924	--	--	--	--
Share tenant--------------------	357,036	267,734	89,302	254,321	712	715	950	886
Crop or livestock share------	115,194	82,582	32,612	84,423	--	--	--	--
Cropper----------------------	241,842	185,152	56,690	169,898	703	680	918	829
Cash, share-cash, crop or livestock share (combined)---	170,424	124,136	46,288	123,347	724	760	--	--
Other or not reported----------	27,291	20,143	7,148	18,936	--	--	--	--

---

[1] The total number of children shown in this table for the United States and regions differs slightly from totals in other tables, the data having been processed separately. No attempt was made to force totals to agree.

[2] Data not available.

[3] For this table, color of women and children in the South was not available. Their color was assumed to be the same as that of the farm operator in the household.

TABLE 7.--Replacement indexes: Number of children under 5 years old in farm-operator households per 100 children necessary to replace the population, by selected household and farm characteristics, for the United States and regions, with color for the South, 1950

(Index not shown where based on less than 160,000 women 15 to 49 years old)

Characteristic	United States	North and West	South		
			Total	White	Nonwhite
All farm-operator households	168	157	177	163	220
ECONOMIC CLASS OF FARM					
Commercial	171	161	182	164	228
Classes I and II	151	159	145	144	--
Class III	163	165			
Class IV	161	159	164	153	--
Class V	179	158	189	168	240
Class VI	202	160	209	189	239
Noncommercial	161	144	170	160	196
Part-time or abnormal	150	130	162	155	--
Residential	170	157	174	164	--
DEGREE OF DEPENDENCE ON AGRICULTURE IN 1949					
Operator's family--					
Without nonfarm income	174	163	177	163	219
With nonfarm income	164	154	171	161	216
Value of farm sales greater than nonfarm income	171	162	182	165	226
Value of farm sales less than nonfarm income	157	146	164	157	--
With no off-farm work	180	168	188	175	222
Without nonfarm income	174	163	186	166	221
With nonfarm income	196	--	196	195	--
With no off-farm work by operator but some by family member	122	93	143	115	--
With off-farm work by operator	165	158	172	160	209
Value of farm sales greater than nonfarm income	182	172	194	177	--
Value of farm sales less than nonfarm income	153	147	158	151	--
Days worked by operator:					
1 to 49	184	161	208	183	--
50 to 199	165	172	158	145	163
200 or more	155	148	160	158	
Other or not reported	177	--	--	--	--
TYPE OF FARM					
Field crops, except vegetables, fruits, or nuts	189	167	195	178	227
Cash grain	166	164	--	--	--
Cotton	193	--	192	169	223
Other (mostly tobacco)	202	--	203	190	233
Dairy	160	173	--	135	--
Livestock, including poultry	158	156	153		
General farming	168	163	177	--	--
Vegetables, fruits, nuts, and miscellaneous	--	--	--	--	--
TENURE OF FARM					
Full owner	148	142	154	147	213
Part owner or manager	159	158	159	150	
Tenant	203	176	216	198	239
Cash or share-cash	198	177	232	--	[2] 253
Share tenant	210	185	217	196	239
Crop or livestock share	209	[1] 185	223	204	[2] 253
Cropper	212	(1)	212	185	228
Other or not reported	--	--	--	--	--

---

[1] The small number of cropper households in the North and West not available separately. Included with crop or livestock share.

[2] Index for cash, share-cash, and crop or livestock share tenants combined.